

## ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED A.D. 1730.

**FIRE, LIFE, SEA, ACCIDENTS, BURGLARY, ANNUITIES,  
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY**  
(Including ACCIDENTS to DOMESTIC SERVANTS).

The Corporation will act as:—

EXECUTOR OF WILLS.

TRUSTEE OF WILLS AND SETTLEMENTS.

*Special Terms granted to ANNUITANTS when health is impaired.*

Apply for Full Prospectus to the Secretary.

Head Office: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

## LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST

SOCIETY, LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232, STRAND LONDON, W.C.

(OPPOSITE THE LAW COURTS).

REMOVED FROM No. 24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1833.

Capital Stock ... £400,000

Debenture Stock ... £278,130

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.

Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.

W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

PHOENIX ASSURANCE CO., Ltd.

## PHOENIX FIRE OFFICE.

ESTABLISHED 1782.

19, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

FIRE.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

BURGLARY. PERSONAL ACCIDENT.

FIDELITY GUARANTEE.

## LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,  
SIMPLE,

THE  
PERFECTED  
OF  
LIFE  
ASSURANCE.

AND  
SECURE.

FUNDS - - - £5,123,000. INCOME - - - £678,000.  
YEARLY BUSINESS - £2,600,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £19,000,000.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. The Earl of HALSBURY.

The Hon. Mr. Justice KEENEWICH.

His Honour Judge BACON.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.  
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice.

Ellis-Danvers, Edmund Henry, Esq.

Finch, Arthur J., Esq.

Freere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.

Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., C.B.

K.C.

Johnson, Charles P., Esq.

Kekewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice.

Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.

Mathew, The Right Hon. Sir J. C.  
Meek, A. Grant, Esq., J.P. (Devizes).

Mellor, The Right Hon. John W. K.C.

Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).

Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.

Rawie, Thomas, Esq.

Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.

Tweddle, R. W., Esq.

Williams, Romer, Esq., J.P., D.L.

Williams, William, Esq.

## The Solicitors' Journal

and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 6, 1907.

\* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

### Notice.

A Digest of all the Cases reported in the "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter" during the legal year 1906-1907, containing references to the Law Reports, will be issued weekly, as a Supplement, during the months of August and September.

### Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	367	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL .....	375
THE GOVERNMENT BILL TO AMEND THE		OBITUARY .....	375
LAW RELATING TO PATENTS AND		LEGAL NEWS .....	376
DESIGNS .....	370	COURT PAPERS .....	376
REVIEWS .....	372	WINDING-UP NOTICES .....	376
CORRESPONDENCE .....	372	CREDITORS' NOTICES .....	377
NEW ORDERS, &c. ....	374	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES .....	378
SOCIETIES .....	375		

### Cases Reported this Week.

Attorney-General v. London County Council .....	372
Button, Re. Ex parte Havaside .....	373
Oppenheimer v. Frazer & Wyatt and Another .....	373

### Current Topics.

#### The Colonial Stock Act, 1900.

IT WILL be seen from the notice we print elsewhere that Western Australia 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock has been added to the trust investments authorized by the Trustee Act, 1893, subject to the restrictions contained in section 2 (2) of that Act. Similar stocks of South Australia and New South Wales have been, within the last few months, placed in the same category.

#### The late Mr. William Williams.

WE REGRET to announce the death of this well-known member of the profession, which occurred on Monday last at his residence at Wimbledon. Mr. WILLIAMS had attained a patriarchal age—he was, at his death, in his ninety-first year—and it can be truly said that throughout the whole of his long career as a solicitor and a member of the Council of the Law Society he both obtained and retained the affectionate respect of his brethren and colleagues. He was, as representative of the Law Society, the surviving member of the original Council of Law Reporting, and for over thirty years he helped to steer that undertaking through certain vicissitudes to smooth water. He retired from the Council of Law Reporting in 1898, in consequence of impaired health, but he remained a member of the Council of the Law Society until 1900. He was President of the Society in 1865-66. The news of his death reaches us too late for a detailed account of his career, but we hope next week to be able to furnish one.

#### Inquisitions in Lunacy.

TRIAL by jury had its admirers in all classes of Englishmen during the early part of the last century, and it was then believed to be the best mode of trial in all cases affecting the person, family or reputation of the parties to a lawsuit. But there is evidence that at the present day this feeling has changed. At a sitting of the Royal Commission to inquire into the question of the care and control of the feeble-minded Sir KENNETH MUIR MACKENZIE, the Permanent Secretary of the Lord Chancellor, expressed a strong opinion that inquisitions should be abolished, for they were usually either a farce or a

scandal. The cases where the issue of insanity was tried before a jury were the most calamitous feature of the misfortunes of the insane. The recent inquisition into the sanity of the Marquis of TOWNSHEND may have been the occasion for this energetic expression of opinion.

#### The Illness of Guests in Hotels.

ENGLISH tourists who habitually visit the Continent must often have heard melancholy stories of how those who are disabled by sudden and serious illness are ill-treated by hotel keepers; and how they are either summarily banished from their quarters or are subjected to extortionate claims if they are allowed to remain. These stories are probably exaggerated, but it may not be out of place to consider the position of a landlord whose guest is prostrated by illness, and how far his conduct is regulated by the general law common to all civilized countries. There can be no doubt that the presence of a guest who is suffering from a disorder which either is, or is commonly supposed to be, contagious is calculated to cause serious pecuniary loss to the landlord. Scores of rooms may be suddenly emptied by the news that one or two persons have been attacked by diphtheria or typhoid fever. The landlord is, of course, anxious to get the patient out of the house, but he is by the English law under a legal obligation to do what is reasonably necessary for the preservation of a sick person who is helpless (whether the disease be infectious or not). This obligation may in many cases prevent him from ordering the patient to be removed, and he is, of course, entitled to a proper remuneration for his care and attendance upon the patient. Those who accompany the sick person and who are in attendance upon him are, on the other hand, bound to do nothing which may tend to spread the infection, and to have due regard to the interests of their fellow-guests and the landlord, which are sometimes forgotten. The landlord has no greater claim against a guest for loss of custom caused by his illness than he would have against a friend whom he had invited to stay with him. So far as our inquiries have gone, there is nothing to shew that the law of foreign States differs from our own in this respect. The foreign laws recognize no fictitious claim for loss of custom and departure of other visitors, and only allow the landlord to recover as damages the cost of disinfection, destruction of bedding, repapering of rooms, and other necessary expenditure.

#### Murder by Mistake of Person Other Than the One Intended by the Murderer.

THE TRIAL at Thun, in Switzerland, of TATIANA LEONTIEFF, a Russian girl, who shot M. MULLER, a French tourist, in an hotel at Interlaken, mistaking him for M. DURNOVO, formerly Russian Minister of the Interior, is in its details not without resemblance to a well-known trial at the Central Criminal Court more than sixty years ago. The murder was a deliberate one, seven shots being fired at the unfortunate Frenchman, and when the girl, who no doubt acted from political motives, was informed of her mistake she expressed no particular regret, saying that at any rate M. MULLER was a capitalist. In 1843 DANIEL MACNAGHTEN was tried at the Central Criminal Court for the murder of Mr. EDWARD DRUMMOND, the private secretary of Sir ROBERT PEEL. Mr. DRUMMOND was shot in Whitehall by the prisoner, who mistook him for Sir ROBERT PEEL. With regard to this mistake, Sir W. FOLLETT, in opening the case for the prosecution, said that it would not, of course, alter the legal complexion or consequences of the act, and the Public Prosecutor at the Swiss trial also observed that the mistake made by the prisoner in supposing M. MULLER to be M. DURNOVO could have no influence on the verdict, and that she must be taken to have been guilty of premeditated murder. The trial of MACNAGHTEN, who was proved to have believed that he was an object of persecution by the Tories, ended, as is well known, in a verdict of "Not guilty, on the ground of insanity," and this result led the House of Lords to refer certain questions to the judges on the state of the law relating to crimes committed by persons supposed to be insane. The answers to these questions have ever since found a place in our text-books on criminal law. We are disposed to think that a similar verdict to that in *Macnaghten's case* might have been given at the Swiss trial, but the jury found a verdict of guilty with extenuating circumstances.

on the ground that the prisoner acted in a condition of "diminished freedom of will." The sentence passed upon her—four years' imprisonment, to date from the time of her arrest, with banishment from the canton for twenty years—was surely a lenient one. The verdict of the jury in the English case saved MACNAGHTEN from the punishment of death as a criminal, but he passed the rest of his life in confinement as a lunatic.

#### Inequalities in Punishment.

THERE ARE obvious objections to the criticism which is often bestowed upon the disparity in the sentences upon criminals who are found guilty of similar offences. The writer was not present at the trial; he had not the opportunity of seeing the criminal and watching the demeanour of the witnesses; and it may often happen that some material circumstance is omitted from the reports of the hearing of these cases in the daily press. But, when all this has been said, we are bound to say that we were greatly perplexed at the result of two trials at the recent sittings of the Central Criminal Court. These cases had some points of resemblance. In the first, a young man twenty-one years old was charged with the murder of a young woman to whom he had been engaged. She had broken off the engagement, a common enough incident, and meeting her in the street in company with her sister, he stabs her in several places with a knife and threatens the sister that he will serve her in the same way. One of the wounds is mortal and the girl dies immediately afterwards. The prisoner, after he has been arrested, expresses deep regret for what has happened, and sets up what we can only describe as the impossible defence that he was cutting a pencil with the knife and that the girl threw herself against the blade. The jury found him guilty of manslaughter; a most merciful verdict. The sentence is six months' imprisonment with hard labour, a sentence which we have often known to be passed upon one who has given another a severe beating with his fists. In the second case the prisoner, who was some years older than the other offender, was charged with the murder of his sister. He and a woman with whom he lived were in destitute circumstances, and were threatened with eviction from the room which they occupied. He had previously begged from his sister, and he now searched for her, found her in a public-house, and asked her and her husband for a few shillings to pay his rent. He was told that they had nothing to give him, and shortly afterwards stabbed his sister as she was leaving the public-house, to which she had returned. He is found guilty of murder and sentenced to death. It is unnecessary to say anything in mitigation of his crime, but surely there is great inequality in the way in which the two offenders are dealt with by the law.

#### Distress Levied by Looking Through a Window.

CAN A distress be levied on goods in a room by simply looking through a window and scheduling the goods? This curious question was raised in a case tried in the Bow County Court on the 25th of March. The action was brought by the tenant of the lower part of a house against a bailiff to recover damages for illegal distress. It appeared that when the bailiff went to the house he found the kitchen door unlocked, and as there was not sufficient furniture in this room to satisfy the distress, he looked through the window of the front room, without breaking it open, and scheduled certain articles of furniture. The rent was paid the same evening, but not the cost of the brokerage. The case for the plaintiff was that the defendant had forced the kitchen door in the first instance; that the levy was excessive by reason of the charge for brokerage; and further, that there could be no levy by simply looking through a window and scheduling goods. The judge, in delivering judgment, said he had come to the conclusion that the kitchen door was unlocked at the time of the distress, and, therefore, the question arose whether or not the bailiff was justified in making a levy on the goods in the front room by simply looking through the window. Had the rooms communicated with one another, the defendant would certainly have been justified in breaking open the door leading to the front room, and he thought it was a general rule that if a broker obtained possession of one part of the premises he was entitled to break the locks in order to carry out the distress in any part of the premises. The second question was: If a man had a right to open a door



in order to get sufficient goods entered upon the inventory, was he obliged to do so? He could find no case bearing on the point, and he thought it would lead to a great deal of unnecessary trouble if a bailiff had to break into all the rooms in a house in order to get sufficient goods. His judgment was, therefore, that there had been a good distress and that the defendant was not liable. We must confess to some doubt as to whether this decision will be generally followed. The goods distrained were originally a pledge in the hands of the landlord, and it is difficult to see how he could assert the rights of a pledgee over goods which were locked in a room and over which he could only obtain control by breaking the door.

#### American Newspapers and the Law of Libel.

IN THE discussions which led to the passing of the Newspaper (Law of Libel) Acts it was insisted that a newspaper was the record and expression of what takes place in public, of all political life, and of all municipal and social activity—in short, it was the record of everything outside the domain of strictly domestic intercourse, and it was unfair that an agency which met an ever-increasing demand of this kind, and which was expected to perform its functions with accuracy, should have to do its work in the midst of red-hot ploughshares, and should be subject to serious consequences for the injudicious language of persons whom it correctly reported. It was stated—and we believe there could be no doubt of the fact—that in a long list of cases criminal prosecutions had been instituted against newspaper proprietors on the most frivolous pretences, either for the purpose of extorting money or gratifying private malice. Some years have passed since the law was amended by the passing of these Acts, and whatever may be the case with regard to criminal prosecutions, there is nothing to show that in this country actions for libel against newspapers have been discontinued. Things would appear to be very different in the United States of America if we are to accept as accurate the statements of Mr. CHARLES WHIBLEY in an article on "The Yellow Press" in the last number of *Blackwood's Magazine*. The author, after denouncing the unwarrantable interference of the yellow journals (which are said to be read every day by five million persons) with the privacy of common citizens, informs us that not long since there appeared in a Sunday paper a full list, with portraits and biographies, of all the ladies in New York who are habitual drunkards, "from which it is clear that the law of libel has sunk into oblivion, and that the cowhide is no longer a useful weapon." Mr. WHIBLEY adds—and we are afraid that the latest news from the other side of the ocean tends to support his statement—"In America trial by journalism has long supplemented, and goes far to supplant, trial by jury. If a murder be committed, its detection is not left to the officers of the police. A thousand reporters, cunning as monkeys, active as sleuth-hounds, are on the track. Whether it is the criminal they pursue or an innocent man is indifferent to them. They interrogate the friends of the victim, and they uncover the secrets of all the friends and relatives he may have possessed. They care not how they prejudice the public mind, or what wrong they do to innocent men. If they make a fair trial impossible it matters not. . . . And nobody protests against their unbridled licence, not even when they have made it an affair of the utmost difficulty and many weeks to empanel an unprejudiced jury."

#### Costs of Three Counsel.

THE DECISION of PARKER, J., in the recent case of *Peel v. London and North-Western Railway Co.* (ante, p. 325) appears to be the first pronouncement on the question of the allowance on a party and party taxation of the costs of three counsel since the alteration, in 1902, of rule 27 (29) of R. S. C. ord. 65. Under the present rule the taxing-master is to allow all such costs as shall appear to him to have been necessary or proper for the attainment of justice, but the learned judge has held that this provision does not alter the practice on the present point. The circumstances which will justify the employment of three counsel have been discussed in a number of cases. In *Smith v. Earl of Effingham* (10 Beav. 378) Lord LANGDALE, M.R., obtained a certificate from the taxing-masters on the practice, and this was to the effect that the general rule of allowing no more than

two counsel had been departed from only in a very few instances, where the great importance of the cause, the extent of the pleadings and evidence, and the time likely to be occupied in the hearing warranted an exception. Elsewhere it has been said that the test is whether it is essentially necessary for doing justice that three counsel should be employed (*Peares v. Lindsay*, 1 D. F. & J. 573); or whether the case is one in which "a reasonable and prudent man, acting with ordinary prudence, would not have ventured to come into court without three counsel": *Kirkwood v. Webster* (9 Ch. D. 242). It has been said, too, that the amount of the money issue involved and the commercial importance of the case may properly be taken into consideration: *London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Co. v. South-Eastern Railway Co.* (60 L. T. 753). In the present case of *Peel v. London and North-Western Railway Co.* PARKER, J., has drawn a somewhat subtle distinction between the question whether a prudent man could have ventured to come into court without three counsel, and the question whether the plaintiff, if acting prudently, would employ three counsel. The former case contemplates a man who, while desiring to conduct the litigation cheaply because another may have to pay the cost, yet cannot in prudence dispense with three counsel. This is the test of the above authorities. The latter case allows a little more latitude; the plaintiff is spending his own money and knows it, and desires to do the thing well, but still within the limits of prudence. The distinction is perhaps too fine for practical purposes, and the real test must be the complication of the case and the length of time involved. PARKER, J., intimated that the magnitude of the pecuniary interests at stake and the commercial importance of the case were only relevant when tending to show special complication. In themselves, of course, they may be associated with simplicity in the issues of fact and law involved. The present case, it will be remembered (see 1907, 1 Ch. 5), affirmed the right of the directors of a company to circularize the shareholders and send out forms of proxy in anticipation of a general meeting, and the learned judge disallowed the costs of three counsel.

#### The Factors Acts and Larceny by a Trick.

IT IS interesting to notice that the Court of Appeal in *Oppenheimer v. Frazer & Wyatt* (reported elsewhere) have held that the protection of section 2 of the Factors Act, 1889, is lost where the goods disposed of by a mercantile agent in fraud of the owner have been obtained from him under circumstances which constitute larceny by a trick, and on this point they have differed from CHANNELL, J., though the decision of that learned judge was in fact reversed on another ground. The section provides that where a mercantile agent is, with the consent of the owner, in possession of goods, any disposition of them made by him, when acting in the ordinary course of business of a mercantile agent, shall be as valid as if expressly authorized by the owner. What effect is to be given to the term "consent" in this enactment? Must there be consent in the legal sense, or is it sufficient that there is a consent of the owner in the popular sense? The point is important, because, where the agent has obtained the goods by larceny by a trick, there is no consent in the legal sense—the larceny negatives consent—though, since the owner voluntarily parts with possession, there is consent in the popular sense. In *Cahn v. Pockett's Bristol Channel Packet Co.* (1899, 1 Q. B. 643) COLLINS, L.J., excluded the case of larceny by a trick from the section, and so in effect adopted the former construction. "However fraudulent," he said, "the person in actual custody may have been in obtaining the possession, provided it did not amount to larceny by a trick, . . . he can by his disposition give a good title to a purchaser." In the present case a professing agent induced the plaintiff, a diamond merchant, to entrust him with diamonds for sale to named customers, and then, in collusion with a third party, he sold the diamonds to other persons than those named and appropriated the proceeds. The jury found that he obtained the diamonds by larceny by a trick, but CHANNELL, J., held that this did not take the case out of section 2. The Court of Appeal, adopting the view of COLLINS, L.J., in *Cahn's case*, have held to the contrary. The finding of larceny involves the existence of an *animus furandi* at the time when possession is delivered, and hence, technically, there is no consent. Consequently, the purchasers would not have obtained a title to the diamonds,

even had they upon other grounds come within section 2. It was held, however, that under the circumstances they were affected by the want of good faith on the part of the agent's confederate, who was their own partner in the transaction, and hence, although personally innocent, they were excluded by the proviso to the section which requires that the purchaser shall act in good faith. It may be observed that this technical construction of the word "consent" is a matter on which the House of Lords, when occasion arises, are very likely to take a different view. It seems quite unnecessary to construe the plain words of a statute passed in favour of trade by reference to the subtleties of the law of theft.

#### Retainer of Medical Experts by Courts of Justice.

A PAPER ON "Medical Expert Evidence," prepared by Mr. CLARK BELL, the President of the New York Medico-Legal Society, goes far to support the recommendations which have been recently made that cases which cannot be understood without the assistance of expert testimony should be set down for trial by a judge with official assessors. In Mr. BELL's opinion, the enormous expenses which are paid to experts have become a great public scandal and "because of this and other reasons, the value and efficacy of expert testimony has fallen into great disfavour among all classes of the public. Mr. BELL referred to the *Thaw case*, and said that if the law could be altered so as to allow the court to refer the question of the sanity of the prisoner to practitioners of recognized skill, associating with them two members of the State Lunacy Commission, the conditions of the inquiry would be wholly changed. There would not have been the slightest occasion for the partizanship which was now exhibited at the trial, and no complaint would have been made of the influence of the large sums of money paid to the experts who appeared in the case. The law as amended might provide that the referees thus selected should be paid by the State, and the amount of their remuneration could be fixed by the judge who tried the case. The statements in this paper shew that the evidence in favour of the retainer of special experts by the courts of justice is gaining ground in the United States of America as well as in this country.

#### The Right of a Commoner to Turbary.

QUESTIONS as to the right of turbary are seldom or never brought before the law courts at the present day, but the President of the Board of Agriculture has just been required in the House of Commons to answer a complaint that the deputy surveyor of the New Forest had prevented a commoner from exercising his right of cutting turves for consumption as fuel in his messuage. The answer was that the right was attached to an ancient messuage, which was demolished a few years ago, and upon its demolition the right ceased to run. A new house was afterwards built, and it was claimed that the rebuilding had been carried out in such a manner as to cause the right to revive. There was a dispute as to the facts, and the deputy surveyor refused to admit the claim, and for three seasons withheld an order for turves. Further evidence having been adduced, the claim had been allowed, and it was proposed to offer the claimant an extra quantity of turves to make up for those withheld since the new house was built. The action of the deputy surveyor is fully explained by the doctrine that turves can only be claimed in respect of land on which a house has been built, for "turves are only wanted to burn in a house."

#### Crime and Violence in Paris.

THERE is much speculation as to the causes of the steady increase in the number of crimes and outrages in the city of Paris, and as to what steps should be taken for the preservation of the peace. Many persons believe there is something in the nature of a conflict between the police and the magistracy, and that if the former are sometimes a little too summary in their methods, the magistrates often consider the cases which come before them with unnecessary care and deliberation. The prospect of higher wages and a more attractive existence brings to Paris, as it does to London, a large number of immigrants from the provinces. Their resources are soon exhausted, and they are thrown upon the streets of the city, to join the ranks of rogues

and vagabonds. It seems to be generally agreed that an increase in the number of the police would be expedient, but there is much difference of opinion as to whether the low wine-shops and restaurants which are known to be frequented by malefactors should be required to close their doors at an earlier hour. Paradoxical as it may appear, many of the police officials consider that while these places are open, the streets, being better lighted and less deserted, are more secure than they would otherwise be. The movement against the abolition of the punishment of death appears to be gaining force.

#### Railway Companies and the Right to Vote.

A DISCUSSION in the House of Commons arising out of the fact that a contribution had been made from the funds of a railway company to the expenses of an organization which took a prominent part in the election of the London County Council has led to a renewal of the complaint that railway companies and other important corporations which pay imperial taxes and local rates possess no right to vote at elections, and that the shareholders or corporators have also no right to vote in respect of their interest in the property of the corporation. But, assuming that this grievance is a substantial one, it is not easy to see how it could be remedied. To give these corporations a single vote would be quite illusory, and a cumulative vote, like that given in Sturges Bourne's Act, would scarcely obtain the assent of the Legislature at the present day. The modern objection to plural voting could also be used as an argument against giving shareholders or corporations a vote in respect of their interest in the profits of the corporation. The railway companies may console themselves by the fact that their large possessions, like those of other wealthy landowners, enable them to exercise a political influence far beyond that of ordinary voters.

#### The Father of the Profession.

WE HAVE at last the pleasure of a letter from Mr. MURTON on this subject, which should set at rest all doubts. He reckons only certificated solicitors as candidates for the post, and his decision is that Mr. ALGERNON SYDNEY FIELD, of Leamington, who was admitted in Trinity term, 1834, is not only the "Father" of the solicitor branch, but also of the whole legal profession; Mr. HAKE, of Brighton, the oldest member of the bar, having been called in 1835. Mr. THOMAS INGRAM, of Leicester, to whom attention was recently called, is disqualified by reason of his having retired from practice; otherwise he would have taken precedence of Mr. FIELD. In our recent notice of him we erroneously attributed to him the degree of B.C.L. He was registrar of the Leicester County Court for forty-two years and clerk to the Billesdon Guardians for fifty-five years.

## The Government Bill to Amend the Law Relating to Patents and Designs.

### I.

THE Patents and Designs Bill, which has been recently brought in as a Government measure, proposes to amend the existing law as to Patents and Designs in a good many respects, but more in regard to matters of detail and procedure than to matters of principle. As the alterations proposed in the existing law are numerous, and as many of them are of minor interest to our readers, we shall only deal here with some of the most important. In the first place, we may remark that it is intended, and provided by the Bill, that, except where otherwise expressly provided, the new Act shall not come into operation until the 1st of January next.

At present when a Patent is granted to joint applicants, it is granted to them jointly, thus creating a joint interest which on the death of one survives to the other, unless in the interim they have severed their joint interest and created an interest in common, which, of course, they can do. It is obviously intended by the Bill to do away with this benefit of survivorship and to provide that on the death of one of two joint patentees the



benefit of his share shall devolve upon his representatives. This is proposed to be effected by the first section, which is as follows: "Where, after the commencement of this Act, a Patent is granted to two or more persons jointly, they shall, unless otherwise specified in the Patent, be treated for the purpose of the devolution of the legal interest therein as joint tenants, but, subject to any contract to the contrary, shall hold the Patent in trust for the persons who would be beneficially entitled thereto if the persons to whom it was granted had been tenants in common." This is a cumbrous, and, as it appears to us, a badly drawn clause; and it is, to say the least, very doubtful whether it would not have the effect (which would be very undesirable) of putting an end to the rule of law that one of two joint patentees can work the Patent without accounting to his co-patentees for the profits. It appears to us that the section ought to run thus: "When, after the commencement of this Act, a Patent is granted to two or more persons, they shall, unless otherwise specified in the Patent, be joint tenants thereof, but, subject to any contract to the contrary, on the death of any one his share shall in equity devolve upon and belong to his legal personal representatives."

The Bill, of course, proposes to amend the law with regard to granting Compulsory Licences and revocation of Patents on the ground of the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to a patented invention not having been satisfied. The present law is contained in the third section of the Patents Act, 1902. The procedure under this section has proved a total failure, which is not to be wondered at when the tribunal which was given jurisdiction to deal with these matters was eminently unsuitable for the purpose, and when the costs of proceedings before it were so very heavy. The Bill proposes to transfer the jurisdiction from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to the High Court of Justice. Under the Act of 1902 a petition for a Compulsory Licence, or in the alternative for a revocation of the Patent, is based upon an allegation that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to the patented invention have not been satisfied. In substitution for sub-sections 5 and 6 of section 3 of the Act of 1902, which are to be repealed, the Bill proposes to enact, by clause 11 (2), that the reasonable requirements of the public shall not be deemed to have been satisfied

(a) "if, by reason of the default of the patentee to manufacture the patented article to an adequate extent or to grant licences on reasonable terms, any existing industry, or the establishment of any new industry, in the United Kingdom is unfairly prejudiced, or the demand for the patented article is not reasonably met"; or (b) "if any trade or industry in the United Kingdom is unfairly prejudiced by the conditions attached by the patentee to the purchase, hire, or use of the patented article."

The object of section 3 of the Act of 1902 was to promote the working in the United Kingdom of Patents, instead of allowing them to be, as they often are, worked exclusively abroad to the detriment of English industry. This object was intended to be achieved by sub-sections 5 and 6 of section 3 of the Act of 1902. These sub-sections are, as we have mentioned, to be repealed by the Bill, but the object above stated will be much more effectively and inexpensively affected by clause 10 of the Bill, which gives power to any person interested, when a Patent has been in existence not less than three years, to apply to the Comptroller for the revocation of the Patent on the ground that the patented article is manufactured exclusively or mainly outside the United Kingdom. The Comptroller, if satisfied that the allegations of the applicant are correct, may make an Order revoking the Patent unless the patentee proves that the patented article is manufactured to an adequate extent in the United Kingdom or gives satisfactory reasons why it is not so manufactured. The Order for revocation is to be made either operative forthwith or after a specified time, unless in the interval it is shown to the satisfaction of the Comptroller that the patented article is manufactured within the United Kingdom to an adequate extent. The decision of the Comptroller under this section is to be subject to appeal to the Court. The Comptroller is, by clause 32 (1) of the Bill, to be given power to award costs in proceedings for revocation before him; and also in proceedings relating to oppositions to Patents, and to amendment of Specifications, in neither of which cases can he award costs at present.

We have just referred to the revocation of Patents on the ground that the patented article is manufactured exclusively or mainly outside the United Kingdom; but the Bill also deals with revocation generally, and proposes to enact, by clause 9, that, except where an action for infringement is pending, any person interested may apply to the Comptroller for an Order revoking a patent on any of the grounds on which the grant of a Patent may be opposed, and proceedings for the revocation of a Patent on any such ground shall not be entertained by any Court except on an appeal under this section or on an application by the defendant in an action for infringement commenced before an application to the Comptroller has been made. The Comptroller is to hear the parties if so desired, and may make an Order revoking the Patent or requiring the Specification to be amended, or may dismiss the application. The section under consideration further provides that a patentee may offer to surrender his Patent, and the Comptroller may, if he thinks fit, and after hearing all parties who desire to be heard, accept the offer and revoke the patent. Any decision of the Comptroller under this section is subject to appeal to the Court.

We now come to a provision of the Bill the expediency of which is extremely doubtful. It is proposed to provide, by clause 17, that where a decision of the Comptroller is subject to appeal to the Court, or a petition for a compulsory licence is referred to the Court, the appeal or reference shall be made to such judge of the High Court as the Lord Chancellor may select for the purpose, and the decision of that judge is to be final. This may be defensible (we do not admit that it is) in the case of proceedings for compulsory licences, but it seems indefensible in regard to proceedings for revocation. If proceedings are taken against a man for infringement of a Patent he will continue entitled to carry the case to the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords, but if proceedings are taken against a patentee to obtain revocation of (i.e. to kill) his Patent, he will for the future have to acquiesce in the decision of a judge of first instance. We are convinced that if a poll could be taken of inventors on this point, the decision would be, by a large majority, against this provision of the Bill. Anyhow, if clause 17 is to stand, it must be qualified by a proviso allowing an appeal from the judge by leave.

But there is a further question—is the Comptroller a proper tribunal for the trial of the matters over which it is proposed to give him jurisdiction by the Bill? This is a matter as to which we entertain the gravest doubt. By the present practice, in all matters coming before the Comptroller the evidence is by statutory declaration. The Bill proposes that in any of the new proceedings before the Comptroller, the evidence shall *primæ facie* be by statutory declaration, but with power to the Comptroller to take evidence *visâ voce* in lieu of or in addition to evidence by declaration. In our opinion the Comptroller ought not to be empowered to try any patent proceeding in which *visâ voce* evidence is necessary. Besides, the Comptroller's duties at present are sufficiently onerous, and how he is to find the time to try, for instance, a revocation case, which would, as many of them do, occupy the time of a Court for several days, we cannot see; and if he is to have power to appoint one of his subordinates to sit for him as deputy, the results would be far more unsatisfactory than if he sat to try the case himself. It is extremely improbable that any patentee would, except under very special circumstances, accept a decision of the Comptroller revoking his patent, and if he appealed to the court, the result would be that the whole case would have to be fought over again, and then there would virtually be the costs of two trials with expert and other witnesses.

At the present time a patentee, on selling or giving a licence to use a patented invention, is entitled to impose any conditions or restrictions he likes. This privilege has been frequently abused by a patentee imposing what are really unfair conditions, and in particular a condition that the purchaser or licensee shall not employ in his business articles acquired from other persons. The Bill, therefore, proposes to enact, by clause 16, that

"It shall not be lawful in any contract made after the commencement of this Act for the sale or lease of, or licence to use, any patented article to impose as a condition of such sale, leasing, or licence to use a condition the effect of which will be to prohibit or restrict the purchaser, hirer, or licensee from employing in his trade

or industry any article or class of articles acquired from any person other than the person by whom the condition is imposed or his nominees, and any such condition inserted in any such contract shall be null and void."

This clause renders such a condition illegal and unenforceable, but in addition, as stated above, it may be a ground for its being deemed that the reasonable requirements of the public with regard to a patented invention have not been satisfied.

(To be continued)

## Reviews.

### Books of the Week.

A Digest of English Civil Law. By EDWARD JENKS, M.A., B.C.L., W. M. GELDART, M.A., R. W. LEE, M.A., B.C.L., W. S. HOLDSWORTH, D.C.L., J. C. MILES, M.A., Barristers-at-Law. Book II, Part II., Law of Contract (Particular Contracts). By R. W. LEE. Butterworth & Co.

The Principles of Indian Criminal Law: An Introduction to the Study of the Penal Code. By ERIC R. WATSON, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

Municipal Rating and the Collection of Rates. By A JAMES PEARCE, A.C.A., Chief Assistant, Borough Accountant's Office, Ipswich. Gee & Co.

The Liberty of the Subject. By ERNEST BROWN BOWEN-ROWLANDS, Barrister-at-Law. Wyman & Sons (Limited).

Registration of Voters: A Practical Guide to the Preparation of the Lists, for the Use of Overseers, Assistant Overseers, Vestry Clerks, Town Clerks, Registration Officers, Rate Collectors, and all Persons connected with the Registration of Electors. By M. MOLONEY, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

Report of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association, held at St. Paul, Minnesota, August 29th, 30th, and 31st, 1906. Philadelphia: Dando Printing and Publishing Co.

## Correspondence.

### The Father of the Profession.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Although I write away from England and with slender materials, a peep at the 1907 Law List has refreshed my personal recollection, and I am able to deal with the points recently raised.

When I initiated the correspondence, the best part of a generation ago, I explained how I came to take exceptional interest in the subject. I believe I mentioned (anyway it may be worth recording again) that in my student days, in the early sixties, I made the acquaintance of a solicitor at Croydon, named Burge, admitted so far back as 1795. He lived till 1870, by which time he had taken out seventy-five annual certificates!

One other member of our profession, later on, achieved the same distinction, and, as far as I know, this is the record figure. But as a great medical authority recently stated, we can all live to be centenarians, given that we take proper care of ourselves, hence there is a chance, for those solicitors who happened to be admitted at the minimum age of twenty-one, to beat such record.

The two particular instances quoted gave rise to my letters on "Longevity in the Legal Profession," and as I happened to be personally acquainted with several patriarchal solicitors (Mr. Mourilyan, of Paris, for example, who in his ninety-sixth year tripped lightly up the stairs of his French office in front of me), I made a study of the "Father" of our craft for the time being—I mean the oldest "certificated" member as contradistinguished from Mr. Thomas Ingram, of Leicester (still happily alive, as your correspondent Mr. C. S. Curtis mentions), because it is practically impossible to test who, outside the official list, may be yet living. Nevertheless it is to be hoped that other correspondents may follow up this interesting adjunct.

Since the death of Mr. Emmerson, of Deal, there is, I think, no sort of doubt that Mr. Algernon Sydney Field, of Leamington, who has taken out (1907) his seventy-third certificate (having been admitted in Trinity, 1834), is not only the "Father" of the solicitor branch, but of the whole legal profession. I just learn that the gentleman who ran Mr. Field very close, Mr. Beckingsale, of Ryde (admitted early in 1835), died last week at the ripe age of ninety-six, having taken out his certificate for this very year!

With regard to barristers in particular, although my old friend Mr. Arthur Burrows (with one or two others, called in the reign of William IV.) approaches the border line, the oldest member of the

bar whose name still officially appears in the Law List is that of Mr. Hake, of Brighton—his call being in May, 1835.

With your permission I will, in the course of the coming summer, say a few words more, as I shall then be abreast of some notes not accessible at the moment.

Alpes Maritimes.

FRANCIS K. MUNTON.

[We shall be very glad to receive Mr. Munton's further communication.—Ed. S.J.]

## CASES OF LAST SITTINGS. House of Lords.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL v. LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL. 22nd and 25th June, 1906; 19th March.

REVENUE—INCOME TAX—CHARGE ON PROPERTY IN EXCESS OF ANNUAL VALUE—RIGHT OF OWNER IN OCCUPATION TO DEDUCT TAX ON INTEREST CHARGED ON PROPERTY—INCOME TAX ACT, 1842, s. 60, No. IV., s. 10—INCOME TAX ACT, 1853, s. 40.

The London County Council raised money on loan by the creation and issue of Metropolitan Consolidated Stock, which stock and the dividends thereon were charged on the lands, rents, and property of the council, and in addition the stockholders had the security of the rates. The council were in receipt of an annual income of £837,000 in cash, consisting of rents and interest on loans on which income tax was paid under Schedules A and D of the Income Tax Acts. They also possessed lands and buildings, which they occupied themselves, of the annual value of £118,000, and on this annual value they paid income tax under Schedule A. The annual interest on the Metropolitan Consolidated Stock was £1,371,000. The council used the whole of their cash income of £837,000 towards the payment of this interest, and they made up the deficiency out of the rates. On paying the interest to the stockholders they deducted income tax thereon. The Court of Appeal held, affirming Channell, J., that the council were entitled to retain for their own use so much of the income tax thus deducted as would recoup them for the tax which they had paid on the sum of £118,000, the annual value of the lands and buildings occupied by them.

Held, that the Crown was entitled to an order for payment of the tax claimed in respect of this sum of £118,000, although the stockholders paid income tax, because the two incomes were different, the persons who received and enjoyed them were different and the persons who paid income tax on these two incomes respectively were also different.

Judgment of the Court of Appeal (1905, 2 K. B. 375) reversed.

Appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal (Collins, M.R., and Mathew and Cozens-Hardy, L.J.J.), affirming a decision of Channell, J., dismissing an information filed by the Attorney-General to recover from the respondent council certain sums deducted by them for income tax on payment of the interest upon their consolidated stock, for which sums it was contended by the appellant they were bound to account to the Crown.

LORD LOREBURNE, C., in now moving that the appeal should be allowed, said: The facts of this case are simple. The annual income of the London County Council liable to income-tax is £956,000 a year. I take round figures throughout. Part of it—namely, £838,000 a year, consists of rents or other sums which the council receives. The remainder—namely, £118,000, consists of landed property which the county council occupies. It does not let this latter property, but uses it and thereby saves the rent it would have to pay if instead of occupying its own property it hired other property for the purpose. Upon all this £956,000 a year the county council has paid income tax. Upon the other hand, the county council is obliged to pay £1,371,000 annually as interest upon borrowed money due to the holders of consolidated stock, and all the property upon which the county council pays income tax is included in the security held by the owners of the stock. Thus the annual value of all the property owned by the county council is less by £415,000 than the interest it has to pay upon its debt. And the annual receipts by the county council from that property shew a still greater deficiency, for the county council receives nothing in cash for that part of its property which it occupies. Pursuant to the scheme of the Income Tax Acts, which require the tax, where possible, to be collected at its source, the county council when it pays £1,371,000 interest to the owners of consolidated stock is bound to deduct from the whole of it the amount of income tax due upon it. They have done so, and the question in this case is how much of the income tax so collected by the county council must be handed over to the Crown and how much it may retain for itself. It is quite clear, and is not disputed, that in respect of the income tax deducted from the £1,371,000 the county council must account to the Crown for the tax they have collected on £415,000 a year, because they have received it purely as tax collected for the Crown, and cannot pretend that it represents any moneys which have already paid income tax. Again, as to the remaining £956,000, the decision of this House in *Attorney-General v. London County Council* (1901, App. Cas. 26) admittedly applies, and the county council may retain for itself the tax that it has collected upon £838,000 parcel thereof. All, therefore, that remains in dispute is whether the tax collected upon the balance—namely, upon £118,000 a year—may be retained by the council or must be accounted for to the Crown. This sum represents interest paid by the county council to the holders of consolidated stock, which is not paid out of profits or gains brought into charge. It is paid out of rates. And on the rates which the council pays over to its creditors it is bound by the proviso at the end of section 102 of the Act of 1842 to deduct the tax and pay it over



at of Mr.  
summer,  
notes not  
UNTON.

mmunica-

INGS.

and 25th  
ANNUAL  
INTEREST  
V., R. 10

d issue of  
green were  
the stock-  
annual  
on which  
ts. They  
he annual  
Schedule  
\$371,000.  
e payment  
paying the  
of Appeal  
their own  
tax which  
and build-

claimed in  
z, because  
hem were  
ively were

s, M.R.,  
sion of  
neral to  
hem for  
stock, for  
account

allowed,  
of the  
I take  
consists  
sunder—  
council  
thereby  
property  
year the  
county  
borrowed  
ty upon  
ity held  
property  
it has  
oil from  
receives  
rsuant  
where  
it pays  
und to  
pon it.  
much  
ust be  
in for  
income  
to the  
se they  
pretend  
e tax.  
use in  
ittedly  
it has  
ains in  
upon  
ed for  
council  
fits or  
e rates  
visio at  
it over

to the Crown. It is said that the effect of this conclusion will be to tax the same income twice over. I cannot see this. The county council pay tax on £118,000 annual value of their own land which they occupy. The holders of consolidated stock pay tax on £118,000 annual interest of the debt due to them from the county council. It seems to me that the two incomes are different, the persons who receive and enjoy them are different, and the persons who pay income tax on these two incomes respectively are also different. With the utmost respect to Channell, J., and the Court of Appeal, I am unable to arrive at the conclusion which they have reached.

Lord MACNAGHTEN read a judgment to the same effect, in the course of which he said he could not agree with Collins, M.R., when he said the Crown could not demand the tax twice on the same income, and that in effect was what the Crown was here seeking to do. The Crown only received the tax once, but if the contention on the part of the Council were to prevail, there might be a taxable income—income plainly taxable, and yet the Crown would receive no tax upon it at all. He put this case as an illustration. Assuming the dividend on Metropolitan Stock to be £100,000 a year, then if the council had no property in their own occupation, and the dividend was raised entirely by rates, the Crown got income tax on the whole of the dividend. But if the Council proceeded to acquire property for their accommodation, the tax on the dividend receivable by the Crown would get less and less until it vanished altogether if and when the annual value of the property in hand assessed under Schedule A reached £100,000. The property itself paid tax under Schedule A, whoever might be the owner and occupier. The point was that the Crown lost a tax on the dividend if the tax when collected went to recoup the council for what that had paid under Schedule A.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD, LORD ROBERTSON, and LORD ATKINSON concurred. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL, Sir J. Lawson Walton, K.C., A.G.; Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., and W. Finlay; Sir Edward Clarke, K.C., Dickens, K.C., and Walter Ryde. SOLICITORS, Solicitor of Inland Revenue; W. A. Blazland.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

## Court of Appeal.

OPPENHEIMER v. FRAZER & WYATT AND ANOTHER. No. 1.  
25th March.

SALE OF GOODS—FACTOR—GOODS IN POSSESSION OF MERCANTILE AGENT—“CONSENT OF THE OWNER”—LARCENY BY A TRICK—THREE CO-ADVENTURERS—ONE NOT ACTING IN GOOD FAITH—FACTORS ACT, 1889 (52 & 53 VICT. C. 45), s. 2, SUB-SECTION 1.

If goods are obtained by a mercantile agent from the owner by larceny by a trick, they are not in the possession of the mercantile agent with the consent of the owner so as to make a disposition of the goods by the former valid as against the owner within section 2, sub-section 1, of the Factors Act, 1889. Where the goods are purchased from the mercantile agent by a person on joint account with another person so as to make them partners in the transaction, and one of those persons does, and the other does not, act in good faith, the purchase is not valid as regards either of them.

Application by the plaintiff for judgment or a new trial in an action tried before Channell, J., with a jury: reported ante, p. 131. A diamond broker, named Schwabacher, obtained certain parcels of diamonds from the plaintiff, who was a diamond merchant, representing that he had two customers for them whom he named. Schwabacher did not offer the diamonds to the customers he had named, but gave them to one Broadhurst, whom he knew, and with whom he had had previous transactions, asking him to sell them. Broadhurst took the diamonds to the defendants Frazer & Wyatt, who were diamond merchants, and who had known Broadhurst for some years, and had had previous dealings with him, and they agreed to purchase the diamonds on joint account with Broadhurst, which they did. In an action by the plaintiff against Frazer & Wyatt and Broadhurst to recover the diamonds or damages for their conversion, the jury found that Schwabacher obtained the diamonds from the plaintiff by larceny by a trick; that Frazer & Wyatt acted in good faith; and that Broadhurst did not act in good faith. By section 2, sub-section 1, of the Factors Act, 1889, “where a mercantile agent is, with the consent of the owner, in possession of goods, or of the documents of title to goods, any sale, pledge, or other disposition of the goods made by him, when acting in the ordinary course of business of a mercantile agent, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be as valid as if he were expressly authorized by the owner of the goods to make the same; provided that the person taking under the disposition acts in good faith, and has not at the time of the disposition notice that the person making the disposition has not authority to make the same.” Channell, J., held that, though the diamonds were obtained by Schwabacher by larceny by a trick, the plaintiff had in the circumstances consented to Schwabacher's having possession of them, and therefore section 2 of the Factors Act, 1889, applied; and that on the facts the defendants Frazer & Wyatt bought the diamonds as to one-half for themselves beneficially, and as to the other half in trust for Broadhurst, and that, having acted in good faith, they were not liable for conversion, but that Broadhurst was. He accordingly gave judgment for Frazer & Wyatt, and for the plaintiff against Broadhurst. The plaintiff appealed, and Broadhurst gave cross-notice of appeal, contending in addition that there was no evidence that Broadhurst did not act in good faith, and alternatively that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence, Schwabacher having been always looked upon as an honest person.

THE COURT (SIR GORELL BARNES, P., and FLETCHER MOUTON and KENNEDY, L.JJ.) allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal. They

said that Frazer & Wyatt and Broadhurst were in the position of partners in this particular co-adventure, and if Broadhurst did not act in good faith that affected the defence of the other partners under section 2, sub-section 1, of the Factors Act, 1889. The onus lay upon Broadhurst to shew that he acted in good faith, and in their opinion there was evidence upon which the jury were entitled to find that he did not so act. It was unnecessary to say whether they would have come to the same conclusion or not. That being so, it became unnecessary to decide the other point, but as it had been argued they thought it better to express their opinion upon it. In their opinion, if the diamonds were obtained by larceny—and larceny by a trick was larceny at common law—there was no “consent” of the owner within section 2, sub-section 1 of the Factors Act, 1889. Upon this point Fletcher Moulton, L.J., relied upon the observations of Collins, L.J., in *Cahn v. Pickett's Bristol Channel Steam Packet Co.* (47 W. R. 422, at p. 425; 1899, 1 Q. B. 643, at p. 659). As to whether the verdict of the jury that Schwabacher obtained the diamonds from the plaintiffs by larceny by a trick could be supported, Sir Gorell Barnes, P., and Kennedy, L.J., thought that upon this point, if it were necessary, there would have had to be a new trial, whereas Fletcher Moulton, L.J., was of opinion that the verdict should stand, there being evidence upon which the jury could find larceny by a trick. It was unnecessary to decide the point, because upon the first ground there must be judgment for the plaintiff.—COUNSEL, Sir Robert Finlay, K.C., Rawlinson, K.C., Harry Dobb, and E. Dunkels; J. A. Hamilton, K.C., and Norman Craig; Colam, and Moresby. SOLICITORS, Julius A. White; F. Kimber, Bull, & Duncan; Sparks & Russell.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

## Bankruptcy Cases.

Re BUTTON. Ex parte HAVASIDE. C. A. No. 2.  
15th and 26th March.

BANKRUPTCY—PROOF FOR DAMAGES BY OWNER OF GOODS WHICH HAVE PASSED TO THE TRUSTEE AS IN ORDER AND DISPOSITION OF BANKRUPT—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (46 & 47 VICT. C. 52), ss. 37, 44.

An owner of goods who has consented to their remaining in the order and disposition of the bankrupt, so that they have become vested in the trustee, has a right of proof for damages for the loss of his goods.

Decision of Bigham, J. (ante, p. 212), reversed.

Appeal from a decision of Bigham, J., given on the 21st of January, 1907 (reported ante, p. 212), affirming the rejection of a proof by the trustee in the bankruptcy. The bankrupt had carried on business as a dealer in curios and antiques, and the appellant Havaside was a frequent customer of the bankrupt. The bankrupt filed his petition on the 10th of March, 1906, and at that date Havaside had about £700 worth of goods on the bankrupt's premises. Some of the goods had been bought from the bankrupt, and left with him until required, others had been left to be repaired, others for the bankrupt to sell. The trustee claimed these goods as part of the property of the bankrupt divisible among his creditors on the ground that they were in the order and disposition of the bankrupt with the consent of the true owner at the date of the commencement of the bankruptcy. On the 25th of June, 1906, Bigham, J., made an order allowing the trustee's application: *Re Button, Ex parte White v. Havaside* (50 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 578). In August, 1906, Havaside proved in the bankruptcy for £715 16s. 6d., the estimated fair selling value of the goods, alternatively for the same amount as damages for breach of a contract of bailment. The trustee rejected the proof, and Bigham, J., affirmed the trustee's decision. Counsel for the appellant contended that he was entitled to have his proof admitted for damages for breach of a contract of bailment. The bankrupt's contract was an agreement to sell or re-deliver the goods. The bankruptcy did not terminate the obligations of the contract, but turned the remedy of action for breach of contract into proof, and under the wide terms of section 37 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, such a claim was provable and ought to be admitted. They cited the dictum of Lord Redesdale in *Joy v. Campbell* (Sch. & L., at p. 338); “If a man were to purchase goods and pay for them, and permitted them to remain in the hands of the seller, who became bankrupt, he would be a creditor for the amount of the money he paid for the purchase.” If the goods of one man are taken to pay for the debts of another, he has in general a right of indemnity: *Edmunds v. Wallingford* (35 W. R. 647; 14 Q. B. D. 811). They also referred to Christian's Bankrupt Law, vol. 1, p. 214 (2nd ed., 1818); Montagu and Ayrton's Bankrupt Laws (2nd ed., 1844), p. 290; *Utterston v. Vernon* (3 T. R., at p. 548); and Cooke's Bankrupt Laws (8 ed., 1823), p. 343. Counsel for the respondent contended that in this case there were no liquidated damages on which a proof could be based. Apart from the bankruptcy, the appellant's only claim would have been for the return of the goods or damages for their detention. The damages here were caused, firstly, by the operation of the statute; secondly, by the default of the appellant in leaving his goods in the custody of the bankrupt and not demanding their return. A person injured by the operation of the statute has no right to prove or claim damages unless that right is expressly given by the statute. Such right is given in two cases, and in two cases only, viz. in the case of proof for damages arising from disclaimer, and in the case of proof for rent which cannot be obtained by distress (sections 55 and 42).

THE COURT reserved judgment.

March 26.—COZENS-HARDY, M.R.—I have read and agree with the judgment of Vaughan Williams, L.J.

VAUGHAN-WILLIAMS, L.J.—I think this is a case of great difficulty. Bigham, J., affirmed the rejection of the proof in question, holding that there was nothing in the two contentions made before him, viz. that by presenting his own petition the bankrupt wrongfully terminated the contract of bailment, and so gave the appellant a right of proof for damages; and that to reject this proof would be to violate a well-known principle of law that where one man's goods are lawfully taken to satisfy another man's debt the owner of the goods shall have a remedy against the debtor for an indemnity: *Ezall v. Partridge* (3 T. R. 308), *Edmunds v. Wallingford* (14 Q. B. D. 811). I agree with him as to the first contention, for a man has a perfect right to file his own petition: *Ex parte Painter* 43 W. R. 144; 1895, 1 Q. B. 85, but I do not agree as to the second. There is very little authority upon the point, because in all the Bankruptcy Acts prior to 1869 goods in order and disposition did not pass to the trustee upon adjudication, but an order for the sale was required in order to vest them in the trustee: *Healop v. Baker* (6 Exch. 740). Further, under the old laws there could be no proof in a claim of this kind, because the only claims provable were those which were in existence at the date of the commencement of the bankruptcy. Such authorities as there are are cases where there was a debt which had arisen in respect of the goods in question, e.g., cases where a purchaser had left goods bought by him in the hands of the vendor, and none of them carry one very far. (His lordship then referred to the authorities cited in the argument.) I shall deal with this case independently of any authorities, except the cases of *Ezall v. Partridge* and *Edmunds v. Wallingford*. I think the principle of those authorities applies, and that the severity of the doctrine of reputed ownership may be mitigated by allowing the admission of the proof in this case.

BUCKET, L.J. (after stating the facts).—In this case, apart from the bankruptcy, the creditor would have had a right of action against the debtor. The statute has taken away his goods, but I do not think it has taken away his remedies for the loss of his goods. It is quite true that if the appellant is right the creditors only get his goods upon the terms that they shall pay for them in the shape of dividends on his proof, but that is a conclusion which I do not shrink from. This liability arose by reason of an obligation of prior date to the bankruptcy, and I agree that the proof should be admitted. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL, Reed, K.C., and Frank Mellor; Hansell. SOLICITORS, Jackson, Smart, Geake, & Co.; Piesse & Son.

[Reported by P. M. FRANKIE, Barrister-at-Law.]

## New Orders, &c.

### The Patents Acts, 1883 and 1885.

#### ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Whereas by section one hundred and three of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883, as amended by section six of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885, it is enacted as follows:—

1. If His Majesty is pleased to make any arrangement with the Government or Governments of any foreign State or States for mutual protection of inventions, designs and trade marks, or any of them, then any person who has applied for protection for any invention, design or trade mark in any such State shall be entitled to a patent for his invention or to registration of his design or trade mark (as the case may be) under this Act, in priority to other applicants and such patent or registration shall have the same date as the date of the application in such foreign State.

Provided that his application is made in the case of a patent within seven months and in the case of a design or trade mark within four months from his applying for protection in the foreign State with which the arrangement is in force:

Provided that nothing in this section contained shall entitle the patentee or proprietor of the design or trade mark to recover damages for infringements happening prior to the date of the actual acceptance of his complete specification or the actual registration of his design or trade mark in this country as the case may be.

2. The publication in the United Kingdom or the Isle of Man during the respective periods aforesaid of any description of the invention or the use therein during such periods of the invention or the exhibition or use therein during such periods of the design or the publication therein during such periods of a description or representation of the design or the use therein during such periods of the trade mark shall not invalidate the patent which may be granted for the invention or the registration of the design or trade mark.

3. The application for the grant of a patent or the registration of a design or the registration of a trade mark under this section must be made in the same manner as an ordinary application under this Act provided that in the case of trade marks any trade mark the registration of which has been duly applied for in the country of origin may be registered under this Act.

4. The provisions of this section shall apply only in the case of those foreign States with respect to which His Majesty shall from time to time by Order in Council declare them to be applicable and so long only in the case of each State as the Order in Council shall continue in force with respect to that state.

And whereas by section one hundred and four of the said first-mentioned Act it is enacted as follows:—

1. Where it is made to appear to His Majesty that the legislature of any British possession has made satisfactory provision for the protection of inventions designs and trade marks patented or registered in this country it shall be lawful for His Majesty from time to time by Order in Council to apply the provisions of the last preceding section with such variations or additions if any as to His Majesty in Council may seem fit to such British possession.

2. An Order in Council under this Act shall from a date to be mentioned for the purpose in the Order take effect as if its provisions had been contained in this Act; but it shall be lawful for His Majesty in Council to revoke any Order in Council made under this Act.

And whereas by section one of the Patents Act, 1901, it is enacted as follows:

1.—(1) In the first proviso to sub-section one of section one hundred and three of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (which section relates to the time for making applications for protection under international arrangements) the words "twelve months" shall be substituted for the words "seven months."

(2) An application under that section shall be accompanied by a complete specification which if it be not accepted within the period of twelve months shall with the drawings (if any) be open to public inspection at the expiration of that period.

And whereas by the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, 1900, it was enacted that that Act and all laws made by the Parliament of the Commonwealth under the Constitution shall be binding on the Courts, Judges, and people of every State, and of every part of the Commonwealth notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State:

And whereas by the said last recited Act the Parliament of the Commonwealth were empowered to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to, *inter alia*, copyrights, patents of inventions, and designs and trade-marks:

And whereas it has been made to appear to His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales, on behalf of His Majesty The King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, that the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia has made satisfactory provision for the protection of inventions, designs and trade marks patented or registered in this country:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority committed to His Majesty by the above enactments, His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales, being authorized in that behalf by writing under His Majesty's Sign Manual, by and with the advice of His Majesty's Privy Council, doth hereby on His Majesty's behalf, declare, and it is hereby declared as follows:—

1. The provisions of section one hundred and three of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883, as amended by section six of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885, and by section one of the Patents Act, 1901, shall apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

And it is hereby further declared that the Orders in Council dated respectively the seventeenth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five, and the eleventh day of May, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, by which Orders the provisions of section one hundred and three of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883, were applied to the States of Queensland and Western Australia respectively shall as from the date of the coming into operation of this Order be repealed.

2. This Order in Council shall take effect from the first day of February one thousand nine hundred and seven.

A. W. FITZROY.

### The Colonial Stock Act, 1900.

(63 & 64 Vict. c. 62.)

In pursuance of section 2 of the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, the Lord Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury hereby give notice that the provisions of the Act have been complied with in respect of the under-mentioned Stock, registered or inscribed in the United Kingdom: Western Australia 3½ per cent. Inscribed Stock (1927-1947).

The restrictions mentioned in section 2, sub-section (2) of the Trustees Act, 1893, apply to the above Stock (see Colonial Stock Act, 1900, section 2).

Treasury Chambers, Whitehall, 27th March, 1907.

On the 25th ult. Mr. Radford asked the Attorney-General whether, having regard to the fact that under the Order in Council of the 1st inst. the Long Vacation now begins on the 1st of August, and that little or no legal business can be done in the several offices of the Supreme Court on the August Bank Holiday, he will consider the advisability of making a representation to the Rule Committee suggesting the amendment of the Rules of the Supreme Court so that the first Monday in August may be added to the days on which the offices are closed. The Attorney-General said he had made representations on that point.

Sir John Lawson Walton will, says a writer in the *Globe*, occupy rather an embarrassing position when he presides at the annual meeting of the bar on the 16th of April. It will be his duty to move the adoption of the Bar Council's report, in which the appointment of three more Lords Justices is recommended. Unless, then, he brings the pleasing news that the Government have decided to accede to the oft-repeated demand for an increase in the number of the judges, he will have a task that will test his ingenuity and tact not a little. This will be the Attorney-General's first appearance in the chair at the bar meeting. Illness kept him away from last year's meeting.



## Societies.

## United Law Society.

March 25.—Mr. F. W. Weigall in the chair.—Mr. O'Gorman moved, and Mr. Forder Lampard opposed, the following resolution, which, after a long and interesting discussion, was negatived: "That this House approves the extension of the principles of the Workmen's Compensation Acts."

## Law Students' Journal.

## The Law Society.

## INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Intermediate Examination, held on the 13th and 14th of March, 1907:

## FIRST CLASS.

Aitken, Arthur Eastham  
Archer, Charles Kenneth  
Crew, Archibald Hibbard  
Duff, Alexander Gordon, B.A.  
(Camb.)  
Etherington, Lilwellyn, B.A.  
(Lond.)  
Godman, Richard Arthur  
Hailes, Edward Thomas  
Prior, John  
Thorne, John Parry  
Whitehead, John

## PASSED.

Ashworth, Robert Spencer  
Aylward, Percy Danford  
\*Baker, Frank James  
Barker, Arthur Prescott, B.A.  
(Oxon.)  
Browett, Arnold Leslie Thackhall  
\*Buckeridge, George Gordon  
Burr, Clifford John Frederick  
Buttanshaw, Mark Noble  
Carpenter, Charles William Alan  
\*Chalker, Henry Cecil  
Clarke, Francis Eagle  
Cobbett, John Christopher  
Cockrill, Charles Whalley  
Corke, Ralph Thierry  
Cragg, Ernest  
Cripps, Ernest Edward  
Darling, Frank Beeman  
Devonshire, Edward Roy  
Dobson, Thomas King  
Downey, Eric Lidiard  
Dutton, Hugh Thompson, B.A.  
(Oxon.)  
Edwards, John Lloyd  
Emery, Thomas Smythe  
Estens, James  
\*Evans, Arthur Edward  
Evans, Dudley  
Fergus, Frederick Brian Arthur  
FitzPatrick, William Henry Mul-  
leneux  
Fulton, George Koberwein  
\*Goodwin, Frederick Claude  
\*Grace, John  
\*Grundy, Geoffrey Stewart  
\*Haddon, Henry Vernon, B.A.  
(Oxon.)  
\*Hatch, Norman Claud  
Heathcote, James Shirley  
Heaton, William Hicks  
Henderson, Ernest Clennell  
Hoole, Francis William  
Humphreys, Harold Langhorne

\* These candidates have to satisfy the Examiners in Accounts and Book-keeping before receiving a certificate.

Number of candidates ... 134 Passed ... 100

## CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATION IN ACCOUNTS AND BOOK-KEEPING ONLY.

Adkin, Guy Tempest, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Duckworth, William  
Edwards, Herbert Ivor Powell, B.A.  
(Oxon.)  
Graham, Allan James, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Green, Arthur, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Hamer, John Lawton Perry, B.A.  
(Oxon.)  
Handcock, Gustavus McMahon  
Forbes  
Jacob, John Hier, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Lake, Harold Walter, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Lee-Barber, Geoffrey John  
Oliver, John Milner, B.A. (Oxon.)  
Robinson, Beltram Ford

Rose, Harry Cecil, B.A., LL.B. Treasure, David John  
(Camb.) Vick, Cyril Hampton  
Spencer, Gerald Theodosius Leigh, Warren, Charles Gordon  
B.A., LL.B. (Camb.)

Number of candidates ... 22 Passed ... 17

By order of the Council,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, 28th March, 1907.

## FINAL EXAMINATION.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Final Examination, held on the 11th and 12th of March, 1907:

Addie, Clive Copestake Forrester  
Ambrose, William Edmund  
Andrews, Edward Joseph  
Atkinson, John  
Bailey, Gilbert Howard  
Barnes, Ralph George  
Bativala, Pestonji Sorabji  
Berry, Thomas Algernon Scholes  
Beswick, Robert Warner  
Bodvel-Roberts, Harold Owen, LL.B.  
(Lond.)  
Brooke, Louis  
Brown, Frederic Holfield  
Carson, Thomas Wright  
Chesterman, Philip George  
Clarke, John Turner Parker  
Clayton, Frank  
Cockhill, Percy Fullerton  
Cuthbertson, Douglas  
Davies, John Lee  
Drake, Frederic Augustus  
Durnford, Guy  
Evans, Thomas Evander  
Gardner, James Selby, B.A. (Oxon.)  
George, Thomas Henry Marshall  
Green, Josiah  
Grierson, Arthur Mansell  
Haddfield, William Helm  
Hall, Arthur Anderson  
Hambling, Herbert Guy Musgrave  
Hendon, John  
Hemming, Francis James  
Hewitt, Alfred Ernest  
Hilary, Henry Octoby  
Hill, Leonard Garerd  
Holt, Charles Louis John, M.A.  
(Vict.)  
Hothersall, Charles Ernest Ellis  
Isamay, John  
Jeffery, Herbert Athelstan  
Jolly, Albert  
Jones, Edward Hurford

Number of candidates ... 144 Passed ... 77

By order of the Council,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, 28th March, 1907.

## Obituary.

## Mr. W. J. Beckingsale.

Mr. William Jefferies Beckingsale, solicitor, of Newport, Isle of Wight, died on the 29th ult., at the age of ninety-five years. He was admitted in 1835, and had practised nearly the whole time since at Newport and Ryde. He retained almost to the last his mental powers.

## Mr. James Beal.

Mr. James Beal, solicitor, of Exeter, was found dead in his bath on Sunday last, having committed suicide during temporary insanity, apparently caused by a painful disorder from which he suffered. Mr. Beal was admitted in 1886. He was well known in the district as an able advocate and a good lawyer. He was clerk to the Wonford Petty Sessions, and on Monday the chairman said that he had formed a high opinion of Mr. Beal's sterling worth, both as a lawyer and a man. As clerk to the bench he performed his duties in an admirable manner, and the magistrates were indebted to him for his excellent legal assistance. As an advocate he was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues. He had played many parts in the course of his life. The profession and the public, and especially the bench, would miss him very much.

## Mr. C. Diver.

The death is announced of Mr. Charles Diver, solicitor, of Great Yarmouth, one of the best-known members of the legal profession in the Eastern Counties. He was admitted in 1859, and was Clerk to the County and Borough Magistrates at Yarmouth, and Clerk to the Guardians. He was formerly Mayor of Yarmouth and subsequently became Town Clerk.

## Legal News.

### Appointments.

Mr. ALLAN CYPRIAN BOURNE WEBB, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury, in succession to Mr. Chadwyck-Healey, K.C., resigned.

Mr. HENRY GORDON SHEE, K.C., has been appointed Recorder of Liverpool, in the place of Mr. William Pickford, K.C., appointed a Judge of the High Court.

### Dissolution.

SEPTIMUS CASTLE, THOMAS RYDER MAWDSLEY, and GEORGE WILLIAM ALLEN, solicitors (Whitley & Co.), Liverpool. Oct. 1. So far as regards the said Thomas Ryder Mawdsley, who retires from the firm as from Oct. 1, 1906. [Gazette, March 29.]

### General.

Flora Miller, of Kokomo, Indiana, has, says the *Daily Graphic*, filed a suit for divorce because her husband is such a bad poker player and yet a persistent gambler. In consequence he loses all the money which should go to household expenses. Here, in official language, is a paragraph from the divorce petition: "The defendant was an inveterate but unsuccessful gambler. He was not possessed of sufficient judgment to estimate the commercial value of a pair of deuces, and he had been known to hazard heavily and persistently on an ace full when he had notified that his adversary was in open, notorious, and undisputed possession of two pairs of queens."

The Paris correspondent of the *Times* says that French juries, in giving expression to their objection to the abolition of capital punishment, reflect the bulk of public opinion on the subject. One of them—that of the Department of the Seine, which includes Paris—appealed in the matter to the Minister of Justice. Their address runs thus: "The undersigned members of the jury for the assizes of the Seine, opened in Paris on the 16th of March, 1907, express the wish that in the penalties to be applied capital punishment should be maintained. They also express the wish that the application of capital punishment should in future not take place in public." Out of thirty-one jurymen only three withheld their signatures. The movement against the abolition of capital punishment is due to the appalling increase of murders, most of which are perpetrated by the Paris apaches.

Probate in quadruplicate of the will of the late Lord Grimthorpe was last week, says the *Daily Telegraph*, granted in London after a lapse of nearly two years since the peer's decease, which occurred on the 29th of April, 1905. As the result of an action, the President of the Probate Division pronounced for the force and validity of the will dated the 9th of February, 1901, with twenty-five codicils. The will and several of the codicils are written (many of the codicils in the crabbed hand of the testator) on sheets of foolscap, and several of the codicils are merely headed "Another codicil to my will." But the fourth codicil is written on the back of a circular dated in December, 1902, convening an extraordinary general meeting of the East India and Ceylon Tea Co.; the eleventh on the back of a letter from a Court photographer, asking for a sitting; and the twenty-third on the back of a circular announcing a dinner of the Hardwicke Society. The difficulties in the way of a correct reading can only be appreciated by a perusal of the documents, which, notwithstanding their number, are contained within 123 folios—that is to say, 11,070 words. Many of the words are very indistinct; there are numerous abbreviations, alterations, and interlineations; and, strangest of all, some of the amounts are given merely in ciphers, as "000."

Writing on "Law and Luncheons," a contributor to the *Daily Telegraph* says: Even the hard-driven law has to pause to be fed. There is no poetic fancy in its composition that spurns solid sustenance. A brief marked 200 guineas may be a feast for the eye which many a stuff-gownsmen would forego a week's luxurious living to enjoy, but it fails to touch the stomach. It is fortunate for the client that he does not have to pay even indirect fees for the food and drink of his lawyer. That would add a new terror to litigation. He is so far better off now than he was a few centuries ago. A bill of costs in the time of Edward IV. contained such items as these: "For a breakfast at Westminster, spent on counsel, 1s. 6d.; to another time for boat hire and breakfasts for two days, 1s. 6d." In the parish book of St. Margaret's, Westminster, an ancient accountant made the following entry: "Paid to Roger Fylpott, barrister-at-law, for his counsel, 3s. 8d., with fourpence for his dinner"; and in the cherished records of Elizabeth's time, kept at Lyme Regis, there appears an item of 3s. 4d. for wine and sugar paid to the corporation counsel. There is a reasonableness about these disbursements which one would hardly expect to find to-day were lawyers fed at the expense of clients. Yet it cannot be alleged that so far as their practices are publicly known the limbs of the law err on the side of luxury. Let us see what happens at the Royal Courts of Justice during the short half-hour interval for lunch. Outside that limit there is no need to trespass, even were it discreet to venture a curious inquiry. Their lordships do not dine at the courts, but, like most counsel, at home, or at the clubs—the Athenæum, the Oxford and Cambridge, the New University, the Carlton, and the Reform being their chosen haunts. But their manner of lunching is an open secret. And it is marked by extreme frugality. A chop, or steak, or slice of cold chicken, washed down by a glass or two of wine, or even water, pretty well exhausts

the menu. There is no time for many courses. One time-honoured judge who sits in the Appeal Court follows a unique practice. His wife comes almost daily and lunches with him in his private room, and at four o'clock, if the weather be fine, she returns to escort him home. But the meal is not always in other cases a solitary repast. Puzzled by a knotty point of law or evidence, a judge will frequently seize upon lunch-time as an opportunity to consult a learned brother, and it goes without saying that many a case has been practically decided in that short half-hour's tête-à-tête.

## Court Papers.

### Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	MR. JUSTICE KIRKWOOD.	MR. JUSTICE JOYCE.
Monday, April ..... 8 Mr. Beal	Mr. Leach	Mr. King	Mr. Farmer
Tuesday ..... 9 Farmer	Greswell	Church	Beal
Wednesday ..... 10 Carrington	Leach	King	Farmer
Thursday ..... 11 Pemberton	Greswell	Church	Beal
Friday ..... 12 Church	Leach	King	Farmer
Saturday ..... 13 King	Greswell	Church	Beal
MR. JUSTICE SWINFER EADY.			
EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	MR. JUSTICE KIRKWOOD.	MR. JUSTICE JOYCE.
Monday, April ..... 8 Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Borrer	Mr. Theed
Tuesday ..... 9 Carrington	Theed	Bloxam	Goldschmidt
Wednesday ..... 10 Pemberton	Goldschmidt	Borror	Bloxam
Thursday ..... 11 Carrington	Theed	Bloxam	Borror
Friday ..... 12 Pemberton	Goldschmidt	Borror	Greswell
Saturday ..... 13 Carrington	Theed	Bloxam	Leach

### CIRCUITS OF THE JUDGES.

SPRING ASSIZES, 1907.	NORTHERN.	N. EASTERN.
Commission Days.	A. T. Lawrence, J. Pickford, J.	Sutton, J.
Wednesday, April 17	Manchester 2 (Civil and Criminal)	Leeds (Criminal)
Thursday, May 2	Liverpool 2 (Civil and Criminal)	Leeds (Criminal)
Friday, May 17	End	End

## Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, MARCH 29.

### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

AUSTRIAL LEAD CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before April 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Henry Roscoe, 4 and 6, Copthall av., liquidator.

DARTFORD PORTLAND CEMENT CO., LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard on April 16. McKenna & Co, Basinghall st, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 15.

LIVERPOOL PUBLIC CATTLE SALES CO., LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Albert Thomas, 7, Market st, Lichfield. Barnes & Son, Lichfield, solors for liquidator.

LONDON COSMOPOLITAN CLUB SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up will be heard on April 16. Stark & Co, 33, Southampton st, Strand, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 15.

OLDS SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 14, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Barclay Peat, 11, Ironmonger ln, liquidator.

PALLET BRASS RING CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 13, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henry Pye, 1, Blundell ln, Penwortham, nr Prestos, liquidator.

TARKWA PROPRIETARY, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henry Brown, 19, Mansion House chimbrs. Blackman, Gresham House, Old Broad st, solor for liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, APRIL 2.

### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LEONIS STRAMSHIP CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 8, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard James Blackin, West Hartlepool. Harrison & Son, Hartlepool, solors for liquidator.

NEW RANG SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Charles Vernon, 16, Gt Winchester st. Samuel & Co, Gt Winchester st, solors to liquidator.

WRIGHT, METHUEN & CO., LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 4, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edmund Ashworth Radford, 86, King st, Manchester, liquidator.

## The Property Mart.

### Result of Sale.

REVERSIONARY INTERESTS, &c.

Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD held their usual Fortnightly Sale (No. 832) of the above-named interests, at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Thursday last, the total amount realized being £3,415.



Creditors' Notices.  
Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 26.

BOGUSLAVSKY, ALEXANDER, Backville st, Piccadilly, Tobacco Merchant April 17  
Campbell v Holmes, Swinford Eady, J Vandam, Devonshire chambers, Bishopsgate  
at Without  
LOUGHER & SON, ROBERTY, Canillyydd, Glam, Farmers April 23 Lougher v Lougher,  
Registrar, Cardiff Richards, High st, Cardiff  
STEVENSON, FANNY, Oxford April 25 Behrend v Owen, Swinford Eady, J Behrend  
& Rodger, Surrey st, Strand

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 29.

TOWNSEND, WALTER CHARLES, Seven Sisters rd, Licensed Victualler May 2 Booths  
Distillery (Limited) v Townsend, Parker, J Lamb, Ironmonger ln

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 22.

AYERHILL, SAMUEL, Alcester, Warwick, Rope Manufacturer April 10 Scott & Holyoke,  
Alcester  
BASSE, EDWARD, Tabernacle st, Finsbury, Drysalter April 30 Walters & Co, New sq,  
Lincoln's inn  
BARON, RICHARD, Coventry April 30 Browette, Coventry  
BATT, ELIZABETH DENNIS, Cloughton, Birkenhead April 22 Lumb & Co, Liverpool  
BEARDSLEY, ISAAC, Ilkeston April 30 Huish & Robbison, Ilkeston  
BELL, WILLIAM, Woodhall, Alnwick, Northumberland, Farmer April 30 Forster &  
Paynter, Alnwick  
BIRLEY, ELIZABETH, North Shields April 18 Brown & Holliday, North Shields  
BIRLEY, THOMAS, North Shields, Tailor April 18 Brown & Holliday, North Shields  
BLACKMORE, WILLIAM, Winchester April 10 Shenton & Pains, Winchester  
BLOOM, OLIVER CARTER, Barwell, Cambridge, Lime Merchant April 8 Ennion & Ennion,  
Newmarket  
BROWN, ANN, Park rd, Brentford May 6 Woodbridge & Sons, Brentford  
BROWN, JOHN AVERY, Ivybridge, Devon April 22 Hacker & Co, Newton Abbot  
BURNSTON, JOHN, Liverpool April 24 Radcl, Liverpool  
BURTON, ROBERT LESLIE, Kingston upon Hull, Watchmaker May 1 Thompson  
& Co, Hull  
BÜCKE, RICHARD ANDREW, Second Clove, Wilts April 27 Gard & Co, Devonport  
CARR, DANIEL, Kingscliff, Devon April 22 Hacker & Co, Newton Abbot  
CAWTHUTT, ANNE, Cambridge May 4 Hunsyban & Sons, Huntingdon  
CHATBURN, JANE, Queensbury, Halifax April 25 Elliott, Bradford  
COOPER, HENRY, Hinchingsbrooke, Hunts, House Steward May 4 Hunsyban & Sons,  
Huntingdon  
CRAYSTON, MYLES, Broughton Beck, nr Uiverston, Quarry Foreman April 15 Ashburner,  
Uiverston  
CUMKINGS, GEORGE, Gloucester, Saddler April 15 Champney & Co, Gloucester  
DANIEL, AMY, Fleet, Hants April 30 Piesse & Sons, Old Jewry chambers  
DAWBARN, ALFRED HURRY, St James's pl, St James's st, Pall Mall April 30 Cousins &  
Co, Cardiff  
DUCKLES, THOMAS, Goolie, Yorks, Farmer May 1 England & Son, Goolie  
DUCKER, FRANCIS EDWARD, Chiswick, Contractor April 13 Preston, Bishopsgate st  
Without  
EVANS, ISAAC, Colwyn Bay April 30 Jones, Rhyl  
FARNHAM, HANNAH, Harleyford rd, Vauxhall April 23 Robinson, Gt Marlborough st  
FERRENSIDE, JOHN, Liverpool, Confectioner April 13 Maxsted & Co, Lancaster  
FERGUSON, JOHN, Woolwich May 1 Thomas, Woolwich  
FREEMAN, SARAH GRACE, Hove, Sussex April 30 Kondall & Co, Carey st, Lincoln's inn  
GIBB, WILLIAM EDWARD, Bournemouth April 25 Patersons & Co, Lincoln's inn fields  
GOODALL, JOSEPH, Peckfield, Kippax, Yorks, Market Gardener April 13 Clarke & Co,  
Leeds  
HAMES, ELIZA, Southport April 30 Brighthouse & Co, Southport  
HARTSHORN, WILLIAM EDWIN, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer April 20 Lawson,  
Nottingham  
HILL, Major General ESTWICK, Pall Mall May 8 Holt & Co, Charles st, St James'  
HICKS, RICHARD ROBINSON POOL, Leicester, Corn Merchant April 20 Hicks,  
Leicester  
HOLLAND, FRANCIS JAMES, Canterbury May 1 Wade & Lyall, Bishopsgate st Within  
HUGHES, JOSEPH, Flint, Farmer May 1 Hughes & Hughes, Flint  
HUGHES, WILLIAM JOHN, St Asaph April 17 Foulkes-Roberts, Denbigh  
JACKSON, JAMES, Acreington, Waste Dealer May 4 Britcliffe, Acreington  
JAMES, MARY ANN, Ashton, Breage, Cornwall April 30 Thomas, Penzance  
KEYS, GEORGE WILLIAM, Southchurch, Essex, Yeoman April 23 Wood & Co, Southend  
on Sea

KIDD, ELIZABETH, Grappenhall, Chester May 1 Greenall & Co, Warrington  
LANSDOWNE, FRANK, Stainbrough, nr Barnsley, Innkeeper April 30 Newman & Bond,  
Barnsley  
LEONARD, ROBERT GEORGE, Harrogate May 1 Hirst & Capes, Harrogate  
LOMSDALE, SARAH ANN, Southport May 1 Sandeman, Acreington  
MARSHALL, JOHN, Little Hulton, nr Bolton, Colliery Manager April 15 Monks & Co,  
Bolton  
MEYRICK, MARGARET, Loominster April 13 Watkins & Co, Sackville st, Piccadilly  
MOSS, MARGARET ELIZABETH, Bebbington, Chester April 23 Forwood & Williams,  
Liverpool  
NAYLOR, REBECCA MARY, Wynnstay gins, Kensington April 22 Inos & Co, Fenchurch st  
NEOHARD, JAMES, Beving May 15 Blake & Co, Portsmouth  
PHILLIPS, ALFRED, Maidenhead, Portrait Painter April 22 Fielder & Co, Lincoln's inn  
fields  
PLATTIER, WALTER ALEXANDER, St Leonard's on Sea April 30 Jagger, Birmingham  
ROBINSON, MATILDA, Eastbourne April 22 Hilder & Co, Jermyn st, St James's  
ROBSON, SUSANNAH, Warwick mans, Putney April 21 Hopgoods & Dawson, Spring gins  
ROSENBLUM, SAMUEL, Amhurst rd, Hackney April 22 Tubbs, Aldersgate st  
ROSEB, ROBERT, Cloughton, Yorks April 22 Birdall & Cross, Scarborough  
SARUM, FREDERICK, Hurley rd, Lower Kensington ln, Lambeth April 6 Martin &  
Watkins, Fenchurch st  
SEAWORTH, LOUISA CARRIGAN, Scarborough June 22 Whitehead, Pickering  
SHUTTLEWORTH, GEORGE, Burnley, Paint st April 6 Geo Fillingham, East parade, Leeds  
SIMPLE, MARY ANN, Sutton Bonington, Notts April 25 Moss & Taylor, Loughborough  
SKINNER, JAMES ARTHUR, Eastbourne April 30 Alderson & Co, Sheffield  
SMITH, HENRY, Stoke upon Trent, Sawmaker April 25 Lyden, Nottingham  
STONE, SAMUEL, Oldham May 1 Ponsoby & Carlie, Oldham  
STREET, EMMET EDWIN, Bristol, Civil Engineer April 22 Danger & Cartwright, Bristol  
SYMONS, ABRAHAM, Millman st, Bedford row May 3 Miskell & Nibbs, John st,  
Bedford row  
TATTON, WILLIAM, Bosley, Chester, Farmer April 19 May & Son, Macclesfield  
THIRDAUDAU, WILHELMINA AUGUSTA POSTLETHWAITE WYATT, Tregothuan rd, Clapham  
April 18 Elkin & Henriques, Salters' Hall st, Cannon st  
TIMPSON, MARY ANN, New Barnet April 30 Watkins & Pulleyn, South sq, Gray's inn  
TOMPINS, JOHN, Aveley, Essex April 22 Capron & Co, Grays, Essex  
VENNON, ADELA, Oxford ter, Hyde Park April 15 Farber & Son, Gray's inn sq  
VERNALL, HENRY, Brighton, Solicitor May 15 Verrall & Borlase, Brighton  
WAKELY, JOHN, Aintree, Liverpool April 10 Read & Brown, Liverpool  
WARD, CLARA, Stafford, Fancy Draper April 8 Burke & Pickering, Stafford  
WARD, FREDERICK KING, Waltham Abbey, Licensed Victualler April 13 Jemopp &  
Gosch, Waltham Abbey  
WELLINGTON, SARAH, Oakham, Rutland April 23 Tunbridge, Redditch  
WHEATLEY, MARY, Oxford May 1 Hazel & Baines, Oxford  
WILLIAMS, DAVID HENRY, Lichfield, Draper April 29 Soppitt, Carmarthen  
WILLOUGHBY, JOHN ARTHUR, Hull, Lighter Owner June 1 Headfield & Lambert, Hull  
WILSON, JOHN, Waverley, Liverpool April 30 Snowball & Co, Liverpool  
WOOD, CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH, Isledon rd, Holloway May 1 Gasquet & Co, Gt Tower st

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 26.

ARMISTEAD, THOMAS, Northampton, Brick Manufacturer April 24 Douglas, Northampton  
ASHTON, ELLEN, Walton le Dale, Lancs April 30 Houghton & Co, Preston  
ASHTON, MARTHA, Fenton, Staffs March 30 Hawley & Jackson, Longton, Staffs  
BAYLEY, WILLIAM, Macclesfield April 26 Hand, Macclesfield  
BELL, ELIZABETH, Eggleston, Durham April 30 Faber & Co, Stockton on Tees  
BEVAN, THOMAS, Greenhithe, Kent April 30 Simpson & Bowen, Princes st, Bank  
BOUCHERS, JOHN THOMAS CHARLES, Charnes, Bucks, Commercial Traveller April 27  
Freston, Stratford  
BOWMAN, ALFRED AUGUSTUS, Stockton on Tees May 10 Archer & Co, Stockton on Tees  
BRADLEY, ADA, Godley, Hyde, Chester April 20 Hibbert & Co, Hyde  
CARTWRIGHT, WILLIAM, West Bromwich, Engineer April 8 J & L Clark, West Bromwich  
CHAVE, THOMAS ARTHUR, Bridgewater April 30 Hole & Pagaley, Tiverton  
COOPER, HARRIETTE, Higher Broughton, nr Manchester April 30 Hookin & Co, Man-  
chester  
CORNER, EDWARD, Kilton, Somerset April 30 Hole & Pagaley, Tiverton  
CORRIE, ADAM JOHN, Tunbridge Wells May 1 Nisbet & Co, Lincoln's inn fields  
DUDGSON, MARY ANN, Nottingham June 30 Green & Williams, Nottingham  
FOSTER, THOMAS, Bentham, Yorks April 26 Hall & Co, Lancaster  
GANE, WILLIAM, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer April 8 Simpson & Lee, Nottingham  
GEE, WILLIAM, Freshford, nr Bath, Somerset May 1 Scott & Cooper, Hull  
GOULD, MARK, Bristol, Beer Retailer May 1 Wansbrough & Co, Bristol  
GREAVES, THOMAS, Sheffield May 6 Lucas & Padley, Sheffield  
GWYNNE, EDWARD RODERICK KIRKENS BARLOW, Talybont, Brecon April 18 Williams,  
Talybont  
HAMROCK, ABRAHAM, Nottingham April 22 Berryman & Snook, Nottingham  
HARTWELL, WILLIAM, Okehampton, Devon May 10 Toller & Co, Barnstaple  
HOCKBIDGE, GEORGE, Westleigh, Devon May 20 Toller & Co, Barnstaple  
HOLDS, ELIZABETH, Reading April 30 Brain & Brain, Reading  
HOLLOWAY, WILLIAM, Croydon, General Dealer April 22 Hood, Croydon  
HOWLING, JAMES, Chalton st, Buxton rd, Builder April 23 Denton & Co Gray's inn pl  
HUNTER, THOMAS, Nun Monkton, Yorks, Farmer May 1 Kay, York  
JOHNSON, ELIZABETH, Holy Island, Northumberland May 12 W & B Weatherhead,  
Berwick upon Tweed

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE  
FUND, LIMITED,  
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.  
ESTABLISHED IN 1861.  
EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.  
SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.  
630 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision  
of the Corporation.

Suitable Insurance Wastes for Inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent  
on application.

KLEINJUNG, AUGUST, Wilmow, Chester, Merchant May 14 Hookin & Co, Manchester  
 MOORE, FANNY MARIA, West Ealing April 19 Colyer & Colyer, Clement's inn, Strand  
 NOAKS, SARAH, Colville rd, Kensington April 21 Malkin & Co, Martin's la  
 PARKER, JOHN, High Wycombe, Bucks April 30 Parker & Son, High Wycombe  
 PERKIN, WILLIAM EDWARD, Southfields, Wandsworth, Librarian April 27 Carter, Regent st  
 PREBBLE, WILLIAM JOHN, Plumstead, Beerhouse Keeper April 17 Sampson, Woolwich  
 PRISTON, MARK, Kingston upon Hull, Coal Hawker May 1 Locking & Holdich, Hull  
 PRICE, JOHN, Rossett, Denbigh May 8 Reinhardt, Birkenhead  
 RANDERSON, PAULINA MARY, Cheltenham May 7 Robson, Cheltenham  
 SALISBURY, WILLIAM COTTON, Basing May 14 Cain & Tompkins, Staple inn, Holborn  
 STONE, JAMES, Leicester Forest West, Leicester, Farmer April 26 Burgess, Leicester

STEVENS, JANE, Peckham April 30 Wetherfield & Co, Gresham bldgs, Guildhall  
 STUBSON, CHARLES GREENFIELD, Stanton, Suffolk, Machinist April 30 Greene & Greene, Bury St Edmunds  
 THORNTON, ELIZABETH, Cheshunt, Herts April 30 Pettiver & Peakes, College hill  
 WALKER, REV JOSEPH, Newark on Trent May 7 Sanderson & Co, Queen Victoria st  
 WARNER, ARTHUR WOOD, Worksop, Chartered Accountant May 1 Irons, Sheffield  
 WEBSTER, SAMUEL, Sheffield, Shield Maker May 1 Webster & Styling, Sheffield  
 WHEWELL, LOUIS, Pimlico rd, Chelsea April 30 Wetherfield & Co, Gresham bldgs, Guildhall  
 WOODWARD, WILLIAM JAMES, Redcliffe rd, South Kensington May 4 James, Lincoln's inn fields

## Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, March 23.

### RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALLEN, SAMSON HENRY, Blyth Bridge, Staffs, China Manufacturer Stoke upon Trent Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 BALLARD, ALFRED WILLOUGHBY, Evesham, Worcester, Fruiterer Worcester Pet March 23 Ord March 20  
 BUSHELL, HENRY, Anerley, Boot Dealer Croydon Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 COPEMAN, GEORGE WILLIAM BASSETT, Maidstone Maidstone Pet Jan 1 Ord March 21  
 CROUCH, SAMUEL WALTER, Wroxall, I of W, Coal Merchant Newport Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 DOBBS, ALLAN JONES, Sunderland, Hairdresser Sunderland Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 EVANS, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Accountant Birmingham Pet March 9 Ord March 21  
 FRANKS, FRANCIS BYRON, Church st, Camberwell, Auctioneer High Court Pet March 8 Ord March 22  
 FICE, HENRY FRANK, Moredon, Wilts, Dairyman Swindon Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 GALE, WILLIAM, Swindon, Pork Butcher Swindon Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 GERMAN, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Bolton, Tailor Bolton Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 GLOVER, FRANK E, Hyde Park mans, Auctioneer High Court Pet Feb 1 Ord March 15  
 GRANGER, GEORGE ALFRED, Wolverhampton, Hairdresser Wolverhampton Pet March 23 Ord March 22  
 GRANT, LEWIS ALEXANDER, Manchester, Auctioneer Manchester Pet March 14 Ord March 20  
 HAGUE, EDWIN, Wentworth, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Farmer Sheffield Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 HARPER, ALICE MAUD, Olton, Warwick, Grocer Birmingham Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 JONES, REES, Blaengaw, Glam, Colliery Labourer Cardiff Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 JOSEPH, JOSEPH, Camberwell green, House Furnisher High Court Pet March 8 Ord March 22  
 LATCOCK, WILLIAM, Stalybridge Ashton under Lyne Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 LINTHORN, WALTER HENRY, Kingswood, Glos, Outfitter's Manager Bristol Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 LUXON, HENRY ALFRED, Chard, Somerset, Cabinet Maker Taunton Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 MADDOCKS, RICHARD HENRY, Birkenhead, Contractor Birkenhead Pet March 11 Ord March 22  
 MASON, JOSEPH, Newmarket, Clerk Cambridge Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 NICHOLS, ALBERT JOSHUA, Southgate, Builder High Court Pet Jan 23 Ord March 23  
 PARE, CHARLES EDWARD, Leeds, Pork Butcher Leeds Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 PARKER, CHARLES HENRY, and RALPH ARTHUR UNTHANK, Lowestoft, Dairyman Gt Yarmouth Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 POLLARD, HENRY, Chester, Boarding House Proprietor Chester Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 PRICE, HENRY THOMAS, Hambrook, Glos, Innkeeper Bristol Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 ROBINSON, JAMES, Thackley, nr Bradford, Manufacturer Bradford Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 ROBERTS, ALFRED, Ryde, I of W Newport Pet March 23 Ord March 22  
 RYLAND, PERCY ALBERT, Southampton, Builder Southampton Pet March 4 Ord March 21  
 SMITH, HENRY, Topsfield parade, Crouch End, Hornsey, Fruiterer's Shopman High Court Pet March 23 Ord March 22  
 SMITHSON, CHARLES, Guddess, Lincs, Labourer Gt Grimby Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 SOLOMON, JULIAN DAVIS, Belzise rd, Kilburn, Music Hall Proprietor High Court Pet Jan 16 Ord March 21  
 STEELE, JAMES WILLIAM MYATT, Willaston, nr Nantwich, Farm Bailiff Crews Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 THOMAS, IDRIE, Heolycene, nr Pencoed, Glam, Butcher Cardiff Pet March 19 Ord March 20  
 WAKFIELD, ARTHUR FREDERICK, Newport, Confectioner Newport, Mon Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 WELLS, EDWIN, North Searle, Lincs, Farmer Nottingham Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 WHITFIELD, JOHN, Bishop Auckland, Co Durham, Hardware Dealer Durham Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 WILLIAMS, JOHN, Saron, Llanabede, Carmarthen, Clothier Carmarthen Pet Feb 22 Ord March 20  
 WORTH, MARY ELIZA, Northwich, Innkeeper Crews Pet March 23 Ord March 22

### FIRST MEETINGS.

ALLSOP, GEORGE, Stanton under Bardons, Markfield, Leicester, Farmer April 8 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester  
 ARMSTRONG, HARRIET, St Breward, Cornwall, Innkeeper April 6 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro  
 AUSTIN, WILLIAM JOHN, Penarth, Glam April 5 at 12 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff  
 BALLARD, ALFRED WILLOUGHBY, Evesham, Worcester, Fruiterer April 4 at 11.30 Off Rec, 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester

BERRINGTON, HARRY, Nantwich, Butcher April 5 at 12 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle, Staffs  
 BERNINGTON, WALTER, Salford, Lancs, Grocer April 4 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester  
 COLE, SYDNEY, Dutton Green, Sevenoaks, Butcher April 4 at 2.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton  
 COOLEY, JOSEPH BERTRAM, Stapleford, Notts, Joiner April 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby  
 COOPER, SAMUEL, New Tredegar, Mon, Grocer April 4 at 12 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon  
 COPPER, SYDNEY WILLIAM, Gosport, Hants, Bootmaker April 4 at 5 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth  
 CROMWELL, OLIVER, Southsea, Hants, Cab Proprietor April 4 at 4 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth  
 CUTLER, CYRUS, Birmingham, Glass Dealer April 5 at 12.30 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
 DRIVER, EDWARD, Cottingham, Bingley, Yorks, Pattern Maker April 3 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Mabot row, Bradford  
 EASDEN, JOHN, East Stonehouse, Photographer April 5 at 11 6, Athensum ter, Plymouth  
 FRANKS, FRANCIS BYRON, Church st, Camberwell, Auctioneer April 9 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 FOWLER, WILLIAM JOHN, Duntisbourne Leer, Duntisbourne Abbots, Glos, Farmer April 3 at 10.45 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon  
 FROGATT, PHILIP, Handsworth, Grocer April 5 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham  
 GALE, WILLIAM, Swindon, Pork Butcher April 3 at 11.30 Off Rec, 38, Regent st, Swindon  
 GERMAN, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Bolton, Tailor April 3 at 3 19, Exchange st, Bolton  
 GLOVER, FRANK E, Hyde Park mans, Auctioneer April 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 GOLDBERG, MAX, Artcliffe, Sheffield, Draper April 5 at 12 Off Rec, Bigness la, Sheffield  
 GRANT, LEWIS ALEXANDER, Manchester, Auctioneer April 4 at 3.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester  
 GREENER, GEORGE ALFRED, Gelyog, nr Llantrisant, Glam, Colliery Proprietor April 10 at 11.30 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypriid  
 HATTER, MARTHA, Bruton, Somerset, Baker April 3 at 12 Off Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury  
 HOLY, WILLIAM, Blackburn, Ties Merchant April 3 at 12 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston  
 JAVIS, LOUIS GEORGE, Gt Yarmouth, Shoeing Smith April 8 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich  
 JONES, REES, Blaengaw, Glam, Colliery Labourer April 5 2.30 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff  
 JOSEPH, JOSEPH, Camberwell green, House Furnisher April 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 LINTHORN, WALTER HENRY, Kingswood, Glos, Outfitter's Manager April 5 at 12.30 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol  
 MASON, SAMUEL, Royal parade, Muswell Hill, Provision Dealer April 9 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 MILLS, SIDNEY JOSEPH, Penzance, Staffs, Brick Manufacturer April 8 at 11 Off Rec, 109, Wolverhampton st, Dudley  
 MOULD, GEORGE, Gunthorpe, nr Peterborough, Dairyman April 3 at 2 The Law Courts, Feterborough  
 PARE, CHARLES EDWARD, Leeds, Pork Butcher April 4 at 11 Off Rec, 23, Park row, Leeds  
 POPE, ALFRED JOHN, Bristol, Licensed Victualler April 5 at 12 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol  
 PRICE, HENRY THOMAS, Hambrook, Glos, Innkeeper April 5 at 12.15 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol  
 PRICE, WILLIAM FREDERICK, and LLEWELLYN PRICE, Aberdare, Glam, Contractors April 10 at 2.30 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypriid  
 READ, JOHN, Yeovil, Coachbuilder April 3 at 12.30 Off Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury  
 REDWOOD, CHARLES JESSIE, Bristol, Grocer April 5 at 11.45 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol  
 RICHARDS, JAMES, Frome, Butcher April 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 36, Baldwin st, Bristol  
 ROBINSON, JAMES, Thackley, nr Bradford, Manufacturer April 5 at 3 Off Rec, 25, Mary row, Bradford  
 RYLAND, PERCY ALBERT, Southampton, Builder April 4 at 11.30 Off Rec, Midland Bank chmbrs, High st, Southampton  
 SELLERS, THOMAS FOSTER, Blackburn, Butcher April 3 at 10.15 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston  
 SIGLEY, GEORGE ARCHIBALD, Oldham, Hairdresser April 9 at 11 Off Rec, Greaves st, Oldham  
 SMITH, ALBERT, Swindon, Plumber April 3 at 11.15 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon  
 SMITH, HENRY, Topsfield parade, Crouch End, Hornsey, Fruiterer's Shopman April 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 SOLOMON, JULIAN DAVIS, Belzise rd, Kilburn, Music Hall Proprietor April 8 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st  
 SWINGLES, WILLIAM HOWARD, Leicester, Tailor April 9 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester  
 TAYLOR, BEATRICE MYRA, Loxella, Warwick, Milliner April 4 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham  
 THOMAS, IDRIE, Heolycene, nr Pencoed, Glam, Butcher April 5 at 3 Off Rec, 115, St Mary st, Cardiff  
 WALKER, SAMUEL, Admaton, Staffs, Blacksmith April 5 at 3.30 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby  
 WESTLAKE, OLIVER, Gt College st, Camden Town, Venetian Blind Maker April 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

### ADJUDICATIONS.

ALLEN, SAMSON HENRY, Blyth Bridge, Staffs, China Manufacturer Stoke upon Trent Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 BALLARD, ALFRED WILLOUGHBY, Evesham, Worcester, Fruiterer Worcester Pet March 23 Ord March 20  
 BANCROFT, ANNE, Manchester, Fancy Dealer Manchester Pet Oct 13 Ord March 21  
 BEIGER, DAVIS, Leman st, Hairdresser High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord March 22  
 BERNINGTON, WALTER, Salford, Lancs, Grocer Salford Pet March 19 Ord March 22  
 BRICKELL, JOHN JAMES, and FREDERICK WILLIAM BRICKELL, Manchester, Merchants Manchester Pet Feb 25 Ord March 20  
 BUSHELL, HENRY, Anerley, Boot Dealer Croydon Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 CHAMPTION, WILLIAM ERNEST, Woolwich, Builder Greenwich Pet Feb 22 Ord March 22  
 CROUCH, SAMUEL WALTER, Wroxall, I of W, Coal Merchant Newport Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 DOBBS, ALLAN JONES, Sunderland, Hairdresser Sunderland Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 FICE, HENRY FRANK, Moredon, Wilts, Dairyman Swindon Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 GALE, WILLIAM, Swindon, Pork Butcher Swindon Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 GARDNER, CHARLES, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Bristol Pet Feb 18 Ord March 21  
 GERMAN, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Bolton, Tailor Bolton Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 GRANGER, GEORGE ALFRED, Wolverhampton, Hairdresser Wolverhampton Pet March 23 Ord March 22  
 GRANT, LEWIS ALEXANDER, Manchester, Auctioneer Manchester Pet March 14 Ord March 22  
 HAGUE, EDWIN, Wentworth, nr Rotherham, Yorks, Farmer Sheffield Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 JARVIS, LOUIS GEORGE, Gt Yarmouth, Shoeing Smith Gt Yarmouth Pet March 16 Ord March 23  
 JONES, REES, Blaengaw, Glam, Colliery Labourer Cardiff Pet March 20 Ord March 20  
 LAYCOCK, WILLIAM, Stalybridge Ashton under Lyne Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 LINTHORN, WALTER HENRY, Kingswood, Glos, Outfitter's Manager Bristol Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 LUXON, HENRY ALFRED, Chard, Somerset, Cabinet Maker Taunton Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 MARCUS, BARNETT, Conduit st, Ladies' Tailor High Court Pet Dec 23 Ord March 16  
 NEIGHBOUR, WILLIAM and HARRY NEIGHBOUR, Clacton on Sea, Builders Colchester Pet Feb 15 Ord March 22  
 PARE, CHARLES EDWARD, Leeds, Pork Butcher Leeds Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 POLLARD, HENRY, Chester, Boarding House Proprietor Chester Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 PRICE, HENRY THOMAS, Hambrook, Glos, Innkeeper Bristol Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 ROBINSON, JAMES, Thackley, nr Bradford, Manufacturer Bradford Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 SLEIGHT, JOHN VINCENT, Gt Grimaby, Builder Gt Grimaby Pet Feb 15 Ord March 20  
 SMITH, HENRY, Topsfield parade, Crouch End, Hornsey, Fruiterer's Shopman High Court Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 SMITHSON, CHARLES, Guddess, Lincs, Labourer Gt Grimaby Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 STEELE, JAMES WILLIAM MYATT, Willaston, nr Nantwich, Farm Bailiff Crews Pet March 21 Ord March 21  
 STOCKALL, ALBERT ERNEST, Birmingham, Boot Dealer Birmingham Pet March 19 Ord March 21  
 THOMAS, IDRIE, Heolycene, nr Pencoed, Glam, Butcher Cardiff Pet March 19 Ord March 19  
 TURNER, FRANK, Upton, Essex, Paperhanging Factor High Court Pet Jan 24 Ord March 21  
 WAKFIELD, ARTHUR FREDERICK, Newport, Fancy Goods Dealer Newport, Mon Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 WELLS, EDWIN, North Searle, Lincs, Farmer Nottingham Pet March 23 Ord March 23  
 WHITE, WILLIAM, Stratford, Corn Merchant High Court Pet March 7 Ord March 23  
 WHITFIELD, JOHN, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Hardware Dealer Durham Pet March 22 Ord March 22  
 YULE, JAMES, Trump st, Manufacturers' Agent High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord March 22

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER with regularity it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.

Annual Subscription, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE: SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER, 26s.; by post, 28s.; Foreign, 30s. 4d.

Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 9d.; half law calf, 5s. 6d.



Greene,  
all  
in a st  
ld  
a bldgs,  
Lincoln's

, China  
22 Ord

orcester,  
rch 20  
nchester

urt Pet

Salford

Brack-  
at Feb 25

on Pet

Green-

Merchant

Sunder-

Swindon

on Pet

Bristol

ton Pet

irdresser

uctioneer

, Farmer

mith Gt

Cardiff

rne Pet

utfitter's

at Maker

gh Court

action on

arch 22

eds Pet

roprietor

r Bristol

nfacturer

Grimsby

Hornsey,

22 Ord

Grimsby

entwich,

rch 21

Dealer

Butcher

or High

y Goods

Larch 23

tingham

gh Court

ardware

22

t High

occurring

EEKLY

ted that

sher, at

E PAID

L AND

, 28s.;

h.; half